



City of Newport Beach SPECIAL EVENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE Minutes - DRAFT

Date: September 26, 2011
Time: 4:00 pm
Location: Friends Room, Central Library

1. Call to Order

Committee Members present:

Laura Davis, Chair
Jeff Cole
Janis Dinwiddie
Vicki Higgins
Marshall Topping

Committee Members absent:

Judy Brower
Kirwan Rockefeller

Staff present:

Tara Finnigan, Public Information Manager
Michael Torres, Deputy City Attorney
Sean Levin, Recreation Manager
Shirley Oborny, Executive Assistant to the City Manager

Guests present:

Jeff Herdman
Bill Leach
Linda Leonhard
Jim Mosher
Robert Rush
Lisa Wolter

2. Comments from the Public on Non-Agenda Items

In response to Mr. Mosher, Ms. Finnigan said the written comments he submitted to her were forwarded to the committee in advance of the meeting and copies were also made available to the public.

3. 2011 Process Review

The committee talked about some of the challenges they and the applicants faced during the process:

- technical problems with the electronic application;
- committee not having a set schedule;
- confusing scoring;
- committee members having to recuse themselves during presentations.

4. 2012 Process Planning

a. Application

- Application to be available by Dec. 15 and due on February 15;
- Amount of data requested from applicant should be reduced;
- Ms. Higgins and Mr. Topping formed a subcommittee to work on the application prior to the full committee's review and approval;
- Ms. Higgins to research website companies to help with the electronic applications;
- Application to include language that any funds received would not be used for any political action committees;
- Ms. Dinwiddie suggested breaking the sections down into smaller elements that are easier to quantify (more questions).

Ms. Leonhard stated her preference for a more standardized, online application.

Mr. Mosher liked the idea of going paperless. He felt that the applications should be available to the public online as opposed to having a single hard copy available in the City Clerk's office. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Rush voiced his concern that some applicants who receive City funds could be giving away part of those funds as secondary grants or scholarships; meanwhile, the City denies an applicant who is requesting a small amount of funding.

Mr. Rush also voiced his concern that funding to an applicant could be used to fund a political action agenda. He thinks applicants should supply proof of where the funds are being spent. Ms. Finnigan said City staff is working with auditors to come up with language for the agreement in the event the City chose to verify where the funds were used. She would raise that issue with the Finance Division. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Wolter, Race for the Cure, said they make their budget very transparent to the public. She likes the online application. She thinks it's very helpful to know what's important to the City when they're deciding whether to provide sponsorship funding or not. It would be more transparent that way. It was confusing to her during the last process whether it was more important to fill hotel rooms, to bring in shoppers, etc.

b. Review Process

- Committee could have the option of reviewing applications electronically or in hard copy depending on whether a good software program is found;
- Mr. Cole and Ms. Davis volunteered to be on a subcommittee to look into the scoring of the applications and, clarifying when committee members should recuse themselves;
- Committee members to keep staff informed in advance if they anticipate a conflict in which they would need to recuse themselves.

In response to Ms. Wolter's request about whether this process could be done twice a year, Ms. Finnigan said it has to be scheduled around the City's fiscal budget year because the amount of funding available might change from year to year. Ms. Finnigan would talk to the City Manager to see if applicants could apply for funding for events that would occur in the future.

In reference to the recusal issue, Ms. Leonhard asked if there's ever been any discussion of allowing the Chamber of Commerce to have different criteria for the committee members who are also members of the Chamber. Ms. Finnigan said the policy has to be followed as it stands now unless the City Council requests staff to come up with some alternate suggestions.

Mr. Mosher said the budget part of the evaluation was confusing for everybody because the events are very different. He suggested a subcommittee go over the 10 points and come up with more workable evaluation criteria for the committee to use and see if the City Council agrees.

Ms. Mosher suggested the scoring sheet comments be made available for the public to review next time.

Schedule

Suggestions:

- Meet once a month through the end of the 2011 with a set schedule;
- Application to be available by Dec. 15 and due on February 15;
- Have a meeting two weeks after Feb. 15 to work on scheduling regular meetings, dividing the applications into categories, etc.;
- Public meetings in March and April.

Mr. Cole moved to have the applications available December 15, 2011, and due by February 15, 2012. Mr. Topping seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

c. Committee Composition

Ms. Finnigan asked the committee members to let her know whether they were still interested in being on the committee. She also informed them of the opportunity to participate as an ex officio member instead.

5. Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for October 24, 2011.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:37 p.m.